

**REGIONAL AGENCY  
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN  
FIVE-YEAR REVIEW REPORT**

For the

**INYO REGIONAL WASTE MANAGEMENT AGENCY**

prepared by

**Inyo County Integrated Waste Management**

Final Draft

August 23, 2004

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
	<b>TRANSMITTAL LETTER</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>BACKGROUND</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>PURPOSE</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES</b>	<b>11</b>
	Overview	11
	Demographics	12
	Quantities of Waste	13
	Funding Sources	15
	Administrative Responsibilities	16
	Program Implementation	16
	Permitted Disposal Capacity	20
	Available Markets	21
	Implementation Schedule	21
	Other Issues	21
<b>7.0</b>	<b>SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION</b>	<b>22</b>
	Appendix A. Relevant Public Resources Code Sections	23
	Appendix B. California Code of Regulations 18788	25
	Appendix C. July 21, 2000 CIWMB Letter	26
	Appendix D. LTF Membership	29
	Appendix E. Presentation to the LTF	30
	Appendix F. July 22, 2004 LTF Letter to County	38



## COUNTY OF INYO

Administrative Services  
785 N. Main St., Suite G  
Bishop, California 93514

August 25, 2004

Ms. Yasmin Satter  
Office of Local Assistance  
California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB)  
P. O. Box 4025  
Sacramento, California 95812-4025

RE: Inyo Regional Waste Management Agency (IRWMA) - Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan (RAIWMP) Five-Year Review

Dear Ms. Satter:

On behalf of the City of Bishop and Inyo County (members of the IRWMA), please find attached a copy of the "RAIWMP Five-Year Review Report" for the IRWMA. In conformance with Section 41822 of the Public Resources Code (PRC), the IRWMA has reviewed the RAIWMP.

The County's Local Task Force (LTF) submitted written comments to the County in conformance with Section 18788 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations. A copy of the July 22, 2004 LTF letter is included in Appendix F of this "RAIWMP Five-Year Review Report".

The IRWMA finds that a RAIWMP revision is not necessary at this time. Guided by the current RAIWMP and program adjustments described in the annual reports, the City and the County will continue to implement programs and strive to fulfill the goals of the Integrated Waste Management Act. The IRWMA is considering the feasibility of establishing an updated base year waste generation level.

Please contact me at (760) 873-5577 if you have any questions or comments.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "C. Hamilton", is written over a horizontal line.

Chuck Hamilton  
Deputy County Administrator

cc Inyo County Local Task Force  
Andy Boyd, City of Bishop  
Jim Greco, California Waste Associates

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

## **CHAPTER 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

State law requires that each county, and the cities within the county, review their waste management planning documents every five years. The collection of planning documents is normally referred to as the "Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan" (CIWMP). However, in the case of a regional agency, the CIWMP is considered to be the Regional Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan (RAIWMP). The review is required to be started by the 5<sup>th</sup> year anniversary date from when the California Integrated Waste Management Board (CIWMB) approved the IWMP. The Inyo Regional Waste Management Agency (IRWMA) RAIWMP was approved by the CIWMB on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 1999. Thus, by July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2004, the County Local Task Force (LTF) is required to advise the IRWMA on whether the RAIWMP is in need of being revised. The LTF reviewed the RAIWMP and determined that it was not necessary to revise the planning documents so long as the annual reports prepared by the IRWMA continue to provide updates on the member jurisdictions' efforts to achieve their diversion goals.

The overall framework of the RAIWMP is still applicable. The goals, objectives, policies, waste management infrastructure, funding sources, and responsible administrative organizational units noted throughout the RAIWMP are still applicable. State law also requires that the review address a number of issues, which are highlighted below in upper case, bold font.

**DEMOGRAPHICS.** The calculation of the diversion rates for the IRWMA depends upon CIWMB default adjustment factors, for example: population, employment, taxable sales, and the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Countywide population and industry employment have increased 0.10% and 9.52%, respectively, from 1991 to 2002. Taxable sales transactions have increased, averaging 35.75% countywide. The statewide CPI increased 32% from 1991 to 2002. These factors are important because they are used to calculate the estimated waste generation and diversion rates when using the CIWMB adjustment methodology for diversion rate measurement in subsequent reporting years. Additionally, this level of demographic growth infers increased waste generation. Yet, when evaluated on a yearly basis, the increase in countywide population is insignificant from year to year. Employment changes average less than 1% per year; taxable sales, an increase of approximately 3% per year; and for the CPI, the increase averaged slightly less than 3% per annum. Thus, growth was not that significant according to the demographic factors. While waste generation has increased modestly from 1991 to 2002, the IRWMA has continued to implement diversion programs.

**QUANTITIES OF WASTE.** According to the adjustment methodology, waste generation has increased 4% from 1991 levels. Reported disposal tonnages have decreased 7% in 2002 from 1991 countywide levels.

**FUNDING SOURCES AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES.** Funding amounts and sources and staffing levels have been maintained by the IRWMA.

**PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION.** Program implementation, as documented by the IRWMA, on behalf of the member jurisdictions (e.g., City of Bishop, County), in the annual reports, has been sustained. Most selected programs have been implemented and new programs started. The most effective programs have been those based at the landfills, particularly the

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

Bishop-Sunland Landfill (BSLF), the largest landfill. Drop-off programs have been established at the BSLF for reusable furniture, appliances, household items, and other reusable items. Drop-off programs have also been established for California Redemption Value beverage containers, newspaper, cardboard, glass, plastic "food and beverage" containers, tires, brush/yard waste, wood, scrap metal, inert materials, HHW, electronic waste, CRT's, and universal waste.

**PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY.** Significant countywide permitted disposal capacity exists in the County at five permitted disposal sites (e.g., Bishop-Sunland Landfill, Independence Disposal Site, Lone Pine Disposal Site, Shoshone Disposal Site, and Tecopa Disposal Site). These facilities receive wastes generated within the County, which must be properly disposed. At projected waste input rates, the jurisdictions rely on available disposal capacity at the sites in excess of the required 15-years of disposal capacity. Estimated permitted disposal capacity exceeds 80 years.

**AVAILABLE MARKETS.** Markets for recoverable materials have fluctuated during the past decade depending upon the economy. The IRWMA has relied upon the private sector for exploring the marketability of recovered waste materials. Diverted materials are either used locally or transported to the Los Angeles area.

**OTHER ISSUES.** The goals, policies, and objectives stated in the Source Reduction and Recycling Element, Household Hazardous Waste Element, and the Countywide Siting Element remain applicable and relevant. The LTF meets, when necessary, to monitor countywide diversion performance and provide useful input for the pursuit of AB 939 compliance strategies. Nearly all of the selected and contingency programs have been and are continuing to be implemented. Although a few programs have been modified, overall program implementation has been discussed in the annual reports. Additionally, the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) has been kept up to date. The County and City continue to monitor evolving compliance issues. The jurisdictions will continue to utilize the existing RAIWMP as a planning tool augmented by the annual reports. Available resources will be directed toward the development and implementation of programs. Where feasible and practical, increased efforts will be directed to quantify (or estimate) diversion tonnages for implemented programs and recoverable materials. The IRWMA updates its annual report yearly to reflect current performance and identify any changes desired in program selection and implementation.

In the 2002 annual reports, the IRWMA reported that none of the planning elements needed to be revised.

The IRWMA is interested in discussing these findings with CIWMB staff to confirm that program planning changes can be made without allocating the additional resources to "revise" any of the planning documents. In summary, the IRWMA does not feel that revision of its RAIWMP is necessary, warranted, or desirable at this time.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

## CHAPTER 2.0 INTRODUCTION

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939) requires cities and counties in California to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills by 50% by the year 2000 and thereafter. This is to be accomplished through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities. Diversion credit of up to 10% can be achieved through the transformation of biomass materials. The IWMP is the guiding document for attaining these goals. The content requirements of the IWMP are identified in the Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41751.

PRC Section 41822 requires each city and county to review its Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) or the IWMP at least once every five years to:

- (1) correct any deficiencies in the element or plan;
- (2) comply with the source reduction and recycling requirements established under PRC Section 41780; and
- (3) revise the documents, as necessary.

The relevant sections of the PRC are included in Appendix A. Pursuant to the requirements of the PRC, the CIWMB clarified the five-year IWMP review process in California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 (See Appendix B). Section 18788 states that prior to the fifth anniversary of CIWMB Board approval of the IWMP, the LTF shall complete a review of the IWMP to assure that the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in PRC Section 40051.

The hierarchy stated in PRC 40051 is:

- (1) source reduction;
- (2) recycling and composting; and
- (3) environmentally safe transformation and environmentally safe land disposal.

The process identified in CCR 18788 is summarized as follows:

- prior to the 5th anniversary, the LTF shall submit **written comments** on areas of the RAIWMP which require revision to the County and the CIWMB;
- within 45 days of receipt of comments, the County shall determine if a revision is necessary and notify the LTF and the CIWMB of its findings in a **RAIWMP Review Report**; and
- within 90 days of receipt of the **RAIWMP Review Report**, the CIWMB shall review the County's findings and, at a public hearing, approve or disapprove the County's findings.

CCR 18788 also identifies the minimum issues, which are to be addressed in the **RAIWMP Review Report**. They are:

- (A) changes in demographics in the county;

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

- (B) changes in quantities of the waste within the county;
- (C) Changes in funding sources for administration of the countywide siting element and summary plan;
- (D) changes in administrative responsibilities;
- (E) program implementation status;
- (F) changes in permitted disposal capacity and quantities of waste disposed of in the county;
- (G) changes in available markets for recyclable materials; and
- (H) changes in the implementation schedule.

On October 30, 1998 and again on July 21, 2000, the CIWMB Office of Local Assistance sent letters to jurisdictions clarifying the CIWMB's oversight of the five-year revision process. A copy of the July 21st letter is included in Appendix C. The July 21st letter noted that the five-year anniversary is from the date of approval by the CIWMB of the RAIWMP; that the CIWMB legal staff determined that jurisdictions can utilize their annual reports to update program information, if a revision is not determined by the jurisdiction to be necessary; and that if a revision is determined to be necessary, it may be submitted with the next annual report.

### **CHAPTER 3.0 BACKGROUND**

The incorporated jurisdictions in the county include the City of Bishop and the County. The following AB 939 planning documents were prepared:

- One Multi-Jurisdictional Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) prepared for Inyo County and the City of Bishop by CH2M Hill, March 1993;
- One Multi-Jurisdictional Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE) prepared for Inyo County and the City of Bishop by CH2M Hill, September 1992;
- One Multi-Jurisdictional Nondisposal Facility Element (NDFE) for Inyo County and the City of Bishop prepared by Inyo County Integrated Waste Management, January 1995; and
- The Final Countywide Siting Element (CSE) prepared for Inyo County Integrated Waste Management by Environmental Resources International, February 1999.

These four documents comprise the RAIWMP. The CIWMB approved the SRRE, HHWE, and NDFE on December 13, 1995. On August 13, 1998, the CIWMB approved a petition for exemption from preparing a Summary Plan for Inyo County. The CSE was approved on July 27, 1999. The RAIWMP was approved by the CIWMB at the same meeting on July 27<sup>th</sup>, 1999. Thus, the anniversary date for the first five-year RAIWMP review is July 27<sup>th</sup>, 2004. The IRWMA's medium-term diversion goal is 29%, which was the City's medium-term goal approved on December 6<sup>th</sup>, 1995 by the CIWMB. The CIWMB selected the higher of the two jurisdiction goals for the regional agency. The County's medium-term goal was previously set at 26%.

Neither jurisdiction has requested a SB 1066 time extension or alternative diversion requirement.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

## **CHAPTER 4.0 PURPOSE**

The purpose of this *RAIWMP Review Report* is twofold:

- (1) To document the compliance of the IRWMA with PRC 41822 and CCR 18788; and
- (2) To solicit a wider review, recommendations, and support for the course of action identified by the IRWMA to achieve established diversion goals.

## **CHAPTER 5.0 LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW**

The Inyo County LTF meets as necessary to conduct business. The membership of the LTF is identified in Appendix D.

The LTF met on July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2004 to discuss the five-year review. A packet of information was prepared and provided to each member. A copy of the materials provided to the LTF is included in Appendix E. At this meeting, the LTF concluded that the RAIWMP, with the addition of the information in the annual reports, was adequate and did not need to be revised at this time. The LTF approved that a letter to be sent to the County, which transmitted the LTF's recommendations. A copy of the letter was also mailed to the CIWMB. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix F.

## **CHAPTER 6.0 SECTION 18788 (3) (A) THROUGH (H) ISSUES**

### **OVERVIEW**

California Waste Associates reviewed each RAIWMP component document and found that the documents, accompanied by the annual reports, continue to serve as appropriate reference tools for implementing and monitoring compliance with AB 939.

The RAIWMP goals, objectives, and policies are still applicable and consistent with PRC 40051 and 40052. The selected programs for each component were reviewed. Nearly all programs were being implemented. The annual reports and the Planning Annual Report Information System (PARIS) for the regional agency are up to date. Although there have been some changes in program implementation, schedules, costs, and results, these changes are not considered to be significant.

Furthermore, it is felt that continued emphasis on program development, evaluation, and implementation are more important than refining the RAIWMP documents through a revision.

The diversion performance for the IRWMA is shown in Table 6-1. The base year for both jurisdictions is 1991. The historical diversion rates reflect the impact of diversion program performance.



*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

**Table 6-1. Diversion Rate Trends (1991, 1995-2003) \***

Year	City of Bishop	Unincorporated County	IRWMA
1991	3%	3%	3%
1995	Not Determinable	43%	30%
1996	Not Determinable	55%	27%
1997	-5%	22%	18%
1998	Not Applicable **	Not Applicable **	23%
1999	Not Applicable **	Not Applicable **	41%
2000	Not Applicable **	Not Applicable **	29%
2001	Not Applicable **	Not Applicable **	24%
2002	Not Applicable **	Not Applicable **	13%
2003	Not Applicable **	Not Applicable **	30% (projected) ***

\* Source: CIWMB Website - Diversion Rate Summary (Results) and annual reports.

\*\* Regional agency diversion rates replaced separate diversion rates.

\*\*\* Calculated by using the adjustment methodology with 2002 adjustment factor values (e.g., no increase – no growth).

## DEMOGRAPHICS

The standard calculation method for determining the diversion rates depends upon CIWMB-default adjustment factors, for example: population, employment, taxable sales, and the consumer price index (CPI). Table 6-2 depicts demographic trends from 1991 to 2002. Countywide population and employment have increased 0.10% and 9.52%, respectively, from 1991 to 2002. The increased population and employment gains represent a growth rate approximating less than 1% per year.

**Table 6-2. Demographic Trends for IRWMA (1991-2002) \***

Demographic Factor	1991	2002	% Change	% Change/Year
Population	18,240	18,260	0.10%	0.00%
Employment	6,410	7,020	9.52%	0.79%
Taxable Sales	\$161,371,000	\$220,355,000	36.55%	3.05%
CPI (Statewide)	140.6	186.1	32.35%	2.70%

\* Source: CIWMB Website ([www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp](http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp)), CIWMB Default Adjustment Factors, January 19, 2004.

Essentially, no growth occurred in population from 1991 to 2002 whereas, employment increased by almost 10%; taxable sales, by 37%; and the consumer price index (CPI), by 32%, over this 11 year period.

These factors are important because they are used to calculate the estimated waste generation and diversion rates when using the CIWMB adjustment methodology for diversion rate measurement. Demographic growth infers increased waste generation. Yet, when evaluated on a yearly basis, the increase in countywide population is essentially no growth per annum; in employment, less than 1% per year; taxable sales, slightly more than 3% per year; and for the

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

CPI, the increase was less than 3% per annum. Furthermore, CPI changes are statewide estimates and may not be applicable to Inyo County. Thus, although some growth occurred in some of the demographic factors, it is not considered significant.

The demographic factors identified in Table 6-2 are used in the CIWMB adjustment methodology to project waste generation estimates for reporting years and to determine the diversion rate for each year. Generally, the greater the increase in the demographic factors, the greater is the estimated waste generation.

The source of waste generation by sector is estimated by the percentage of the waste stream generated from the residential sector (single family homes and household units up to four households) and the nonresidential sector (e.g., commercial and industrial enterprises). The IRWMA sector percentages of waste generation are: 71% residential, 29% nonresidential.

The residential sector is further divided by type of dwelling in Table 6-3.

**Table 6-3. Residential Sector Household Dwelling Trends (1991-2002) \***

Demographic Factor	1991	2002	% Change	% Change/Year
<b>Single Family Dwellings</b>				
City of Bishop	796	809	1.6%	0.0015%
Unincorporated Area	4,131	4,292	3.9%	0.3543%
<b>Countywide</b>	<b>4,927</b>	<b>5,101</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>0.3211%</b>
<b>Multi-Family Dwellings</b>				
City of Bishop	581	604	4.0%	0.3599%
Unincorporated Area	305	305	0%	0%
<b>Countywide</b>	<b>886</b>	<b>909</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	<b>0.2360%</b>
<b>Mobile Homes</b>				
City of Bishop	341	354	3.8%	0.3466%
Unincorporated Area	2,505	2,593	3.5%	0.3194%
<b>Countywide</b>	<b>2,846</b>	<b>2,947</b>	<b>3.5%</b>	<b>0.3226%</b>

\* Source: Department of Finance Demographic Data, ([www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRP/E-5text.htm](http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRP/E-5text.htm) for 1991, [www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRP/E-5text2.htm](http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRP/E-5text2.htm) for 2002), 3/22/04.

## QUANTITIES OF WASTE

**Waste Generation.** The CIWMB-approved base year waste generation (BYWG) and BY residential waste generation quantities are presented in Table 6-4. This data provides the baseline waste generation level from which future waste generation is derived.

**Table 6-4. Base Year Total Waste Generation \***

Jurisdiction	Base Year	BYWG (tons)	Base Year Population	BY WG Per Capita (ppd)	% Residential	BY Residential WG (tons)
IRWMA	1991	21,933	18,281	6.57	70.6%	15,485

\* Source: CIWMB Website, Diversion Rate Measurement Calculation.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

The per capita waste generation for the base year is identified in Table 6-4 as 6.57 pounds per person per day. The statewide average per capita waste generation in 1990-1991 was approximately 9 pounds per person per day. The regional agency's base year per capita is notably lower than the statewide average. This low per capita rate suggests that perhaps the base year waste generation quantity does not accurately represent the level of waste generation in the regional agency.

The CIWMB adjustment methodology was used to derive the estimated reporting year waste generation levels for the IRWMA. The results are presented in Table 6-5. According to the adjustment methodology, waste generation has increased from 1991 levels.

**Table 6-5. Historical Waste Quantities for the IRWMA**

Year	BYWG (tons)	RYWG (tons)	% Change (yr to yr)	Disposal (tons)	% Change (yr to yr)	Diversion (tons)	Div Rate (%)
1991	21,933	21,933		21,373		560	3%
1995	21,933	21,582	-2%	15,056	-30%	6,526	30%
1996	21,933	22,484	4%	16,338	9%	6,144	27%
1997	21,933	22,296	-1%	18,320	12%	3,976	18%
1998	21,933	22,496	1%	17,331	-5%	5,165	23%
1999	21,933	22,707	1%	13,446	-22%	9,261	41%
2000	21,933	22,887	1%	16,279	21%	6,608	29%
2001	21,933	23,115	1%	17,632	8%	5,483	24%
2002	21,933	22,841	-1%	19,898	13%	2,943	13%
1991 to 2002			4%		-7%		
2003	21,933	22,841 *	0%	15,912	-20%	6,929	30%

\* Used adjustment methodology with no increase in the adjustment factor values from 2002 to 2003.

Using the adjustment methodology to estimate waste generation in 2002 indicates that the regional agency's waste generation increased by 908 tons from 1991 to 2002 (a 4% increase). This growth in waste generation, according to the adjustment methodology, was minimal, approximating less than 0.5% per annum. This infers that program implementation at current levels may be sufficient for the generated waste stream. Nevertheless, program implementation should be sustained to achieve increased levels of cost-effective diversion.

**Waste Disposal Quantities.** Table 6-5 also includes the reported waste disposal quantities for regional agency for the years 1991 and 1995 through 2003. This Table also includes the year-to-year change in disposal quantities for the IRWMA during the period 1991 and 1995 through 2002. Reported disposal tonnages have increased slightly (5.68%) for the regional agency from 1995 to 2003 (856 tons). Table 6-6 depicts the disposal quantities, which were projected in the SRRE for 2000, and compares the projections with the reported disposal tonnage for 2000 for the IRWMA.

**Waste Diversion.** Waste diversion quantities are also identified in Table 6-5 for 1991 and 1995-2002. The 1991 diversion tonnage was reported in the multi-jurisdictional SRRE for

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

both jurisdictions – the result of the multi-jurisdictional waste generation study. The diversion resulting from the adjustment methodology in reporting years is considered “inferred” diversion because no diversion study was conducted. Diversion was measured as the difference between estimated waste generation and reported disposal quantities. The trends provide some insight into diversion performance.

**Table 6-6. Comparison of Projected SRRE Disposal with Reported Disposal for Year 2000**

Jurisdiction	Year 2000 Disposal Tonnage		% Difference
	SRRE Projected *	Reported (DRS) **	
City of Bishop	3,049	N/A	N/A
County Unincorporated Area	15,477	N/A	N/A
<b>IRWMA (Countywide)</b>	<b>18,526</b>	<b>16,279</b>	<b>-12.1%</b>

\* Source: CIWMB Agenda Item No. 9 at December 6, 1995 CIWMB Board meeting when the SRRE was approved.

\*\* Source: CIWMB Disposal Reporting System (DRS).

Table 6-7 presents the biennial review status and determinations resulting from CIWMB staff biennial reviews.

**Table 6-7. Biennial Review Status for the IRWMA (1995-2002)**

Year	Diversion Rate	Biennial Review Status
1995	30%	Board Approved *
1996	27%	Board Approved *
1997	18%	Board Accepted *
1998	23%	Board Accepted *
1999	41%	Board Approved GFE **
2000	28%	Board Approved GFE **
2001	24%	Biennial Review Not Yet Completed
2002	13%	Biennial Review Not Yet Completed
2003	30% (Projected)	Biennial Review Not Yet Completed

\* Compliance determined for 1995-1999 was based upon reduced goals of 16% for the City of Bishop and 14% for the County.

\*\* GFE stands for “good faith effort”.

## FUNDING SOURCES

No significant changes have occurred in the basic funding sources for the administration of the CSE. The primary source of funding for program implementation is the transaction use tax and service rates. Grant funds provide supplementary funding for certain programs. The funding sources identified for each jurisdiction in the SRRE are summarized in Table 6-8. Contingent funding sources identified were County Service Assessments (CSA's) and bonds.

No significant changes have occurred in the basic funding sources for the administration of the CSE.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

**Table 6-8. AB 939 Program Funding Sources for the City and County \***

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>City of Bishop</b>	<b>Unincorporated</b>
Transaction and Use Tax		✓
Grants (CIWMB, DOC)	✓	✓
Service Fees/Rates, Gate Fees	✓	✓

\* Source: SRRE.

## **ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES**

Although there has been some reorganization of responsible personnel, no significant changes have occurred in the administration of the RAIWMP since 1995. Within the County, the Integrated Waste Management Office is the responsibility of the Deputy County Administrator. Solid waste management activities within the City have been assigned to the City of Bishop Department of Public Works.

The IRWMA has advised the CIWMB from year-to-year through the annual reports of the primary responsible individuals for AB 939.

## **PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION**

On August 13, 1998, the CIWMB approved the County's petition to reduce the planning requirements on the Summary Plan for the IRWMA. Thus, the IRWMA was granted an exemption from preparing a Summary Plan.

**Goals.** Goals were established in the SRRE for each component. They are:

- Source Reduction: To minimize the quantity of solid waste generated;
- Recycling: To divert or recover materials from the waste stream that can be remade into new products;
- Composting: To divert yard waste from the waste stream by composting; and
- Special Waste: Assess the potential for diversion of sewage sludge generated by wastewater treatment plants.

These goals remain applicable.

Goals were also set for the HHWE, namely:

- To decrease the amount of HHW generated by providing residents with educational and informational materials to encourage source reduction;
- To increase the percentage of HHW that is recycled or reused by encouraging participation in existing programs to recycle used motor oil and batteries;
- To keep HHW from being disposed of at the County landfills and other improper locations; and
- To provide a means for residents to safely dispose of HHW.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

These HHWE goals remain applicable.

**Objectives.** The medium-term objectives stated in the SRRE were also grouped by component. They are listed in Table 6-9. Except for the composting facility proposed under the "composting" component, the IRWMA has pursued and sustained the implementation of programs relevant to the SRRE goals. The composting facility was determined to be infeasible with available alternatives targeting yard waste, namely: chip and grind for use by residents and businesses and alternative daily cover application. However, the IRWMA prefers to view the compost facility as a contingency program.

The objectives identified in the HHWE remain applicable. Where there is a reference to the year 2000, the objectives are applicable beyond 2000. The HHW objectives are also listed in table 6-9.

Program implementation, as documented by the IRWMA, on behalf of the member jurisdictions (e.g., City of Bishop, County), in the annual reports, has been sustained. Most selected programs have been implemented and some new programs started. The most effective programs have been those based at the landfills, particularly the Bishop-Sunland Landfill (BSLF), the largest landfill. Drop-off programs have been established at the BSLF for reusable furniture, appliances, household items, and other reusable items; drop-off programs have also been established for California Redemption Value (CRV) beverage containers; newspaper; cardboard; electronic waste; glass, plastic food, and beverage containers; tires; yard waste; wood; scrap metal; inert materials; HHW, CRT's, and universal waste.

Nearly all selected programs have been implemented. Please see Tables 6-10, 6-11, and 6-12. The following codes are used in Tables 6-10, 6-11, and 6-12.

- SO Selected Ongoing (Program selected in the SRRE and HHWE with continuing implementation.)
- AO Alternative Ongoing (Program not selected in the SRRE and HHWE but now being implemented.)
- SI Selected Implemented (Program selected in the SRRE/HHWE and completed.)
- DE Dropped in Earlier Year (Program selected in the SRRE/HHWE but dropped.)
- NI Selected and Not Implemented (Program selected in the SRRE/HHWE and not implemented.)
- PF Planned Future (Program selected in the SRRE/HHWE and implementation is planned in the future.)

The IRWMA has updated implementation activities in the annual reports and the "Planning Annual Report Information System" (PARIS). Both jurisdictions have submitted annual reports for reporting progress on an annual basis since 1995 with reporting combined for 1998-1999 and for subsequent years after the formation of the regional agency.

The annual reports have provided updated information concerning program implementation.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

**Table 6-9. Medium-Term Objectives Stated in the Multi-Jurisdictional SRRE and HHWE**

#	Plan/Component/Objective
<b>SRRE/Source Reduction</b>	
1	Reduce residential yard waste by 10%.
2	Continue with a backyard composting program.
3	Continue source reduction education and public information programs.
4	Review procurement and waste management policies in order to remain current with new products and technology.
5	Monitor state and national source reduction legislation.
6	Study the feasibility and impact of developing land use/zoning ordinances that encourage source reduction.
7	Continue providing technical assistance and information to waste generators.
<b>SRRE/Recycling</b>	
1	Maintain drop-off containers for newspaper, glass, plastic, and aluminum at the Bishop-Sunland Landfill. Place similar containers at the Lone Pine Landfill.
2	Maintain the reuse exchange area at the Bishop-Sunland Landfill.
3	Maintain the chipping facility for yard waste at the Bishop-Sunland Landfill, and re-distribute the chips back to residents for use as mulch.
4	Maintain the construction debris reuse area at the Bishop-Sunland Landfill.
<b>SRRE/Composting</b>	
1	Construct a composting facility at the Bishop-Sunland Landfill.
2	Divert 10% of the yard waste by composting.
3	Distribute compost to public agencies for use.
4	Develop an education and public information program to ensure participation.
<b>SRRE/Special Waste</b>	
1	Begin the land application of sewage sludge from the County wastewater treatment plants, if feasible.
2	Continue the land application of sewage sludge from the City of Bishop wastewater treatment plant.
<b>HHWE</b>	
1	Reduce by 50% the amount of HHW generated by 2000.
2	Continue to provide public education programs which encourage consumers to reduce and recycle HHW through 2000.
3	Continue to identify end markets with recycling potential for HHW.
4	Continue the monitoring and load checking programs at the Bishop-Sunland landfill through 2000.
5	Investigate the feasibility of a waste exchange program for usable products such as paints, cleaning products, and gardening products; begin implementation of a program by 2000.
6	Develop a plan for providing periodic one-day HHW collection events for the Bishop area by 2000.
7	Continue developing regional approaches with neighboring jurisdictions for HHW management through 2000.

Program implementation, as documented in the annual reports, has been sustained, enhanced, and, in some cases, expanded. Most selected programs have been implemented and many new programs started.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

**Table 6-10. Diversion Program Implementation Status in 2002 \***

Program	PARIS	City of Bishop	County	Comment
<b>Source Reduction Programs</b>				
Xeri/Grasscycling	1000	SRRE	SRRE	Expanded (Parks, golf courses)
Backyard Composting	1010	SRRE	SRRE	
Business Waste Reduction	1020			
Procurement	1030	SRRE	SRRE	Expanded (re-refined oil, park benches and picnic tables)
School Source Reduction	1040			
Govt Source Reduction	1050			
Material Exchange/Thrift	1060	SRRE	SRRE	
Other Source Reduction	1070			
<b>Recycling Programs</b>				
Residential Curbside	2000			
Residential Drop-off	2010	SRRE	SRRE	Expanded materials at landfills
Buyback Centers	2020	SRRE	SRRE	
Commercial Onsite P/U	2030	✓	✓	New program (grocers, retailers)
Commercial Self haul	2040	✓	✓	New program (grocers, retailers)
Schools	2050			
Government Recycling	2060			
Special Collect/Seasonal	2070			
Special Collection Events	2080			
Other Recycling	2090			
MRF	7000			
Landfill	7010	SRRE	SRRE	
Transfer Station	7020	SRRE	SRRE	
ADC	7040	✓	✓	New program (yard waste; inerts)
<b>Composting Programs</b>				
Residential Curbside GW	3000			
Residential GW Self haul	3010	SRRE	SRRE	
Commercial GW Pickup	3020	✓	✓	New program (grocers, retailers)
Commercial GW Self haul	3030	✓	✓	New program
Food Waste Composting	3040	✓	✓	New program (grocers)
School Composting	3050			
Government Composting	3060			
Other Composting	3070	SRRE	SRRE	Chip and grind
Composting Facility	7030	SRRE	SRRE	Contingency program
<b>Special Waste Diversion Programs</b>				
Ash	4000			
Sludge	4010	SRRE	SRRE	
Tire Recycling	4020	✓	✓	New program; landfill-based
White Goods	4030	✓	✓	New program; landfill-based
Scrap Metal	4040	✓	✓	New program; landfill-based
Wood Waste	4050	✓	✓	New program; landfill-based
Concrete, Asphalt, Rubble	4060	SRRE	SRRE	Expanded (Roads Dept)
Rendering	4090	✓	✓	New program (renderers)
Other Special Waste	4100			
<b>Biomass/Co-generation Diversion</b>				
Biomass/Cogeneration	8010			
Transformation/Tires	8020	✓	✓	New program (to Victorville)
Other Transformation	8030			

\* Information obtained from CIWMB PARIS and the IRWMA 2002 annual report.



*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

**Table 6-11. HHW Management Program Implementation \***

<b>Program</b>	<b>PARIS</b>	<b>City of Bishop</b>	<b>County</b>
Permanent Facility	9000	New	New
Mobile/Periodic Collection	9010	HHWE	HHWE
Curbside Collection	9020		
Waste Exchange	9030	HHWE	HHWE
Education Programs	9040	HHWE	HHWE
Other HHW Program	9050	HHWE (Load checking)	HHWE (Load checking)

\* Information obtained from CIWMB PARIS and the IRWMA 2002 annual report.

**Table 6-12. Public Information Program Implementation \***

<b>Program</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>City of Bishop</b>	<b>County</b>
Electronic	5000	SRRE	SRRE
Print	5010	SRRE	SRRE
Outreach	5020	SRRE	SRRE
Schools	5030	SRRE	SRRE
Product and Landfill Bans	6000		
Economic Incentives	6010	New (LF rates)	New (LF rates)
Ordinances	6020		
Other Policy Incentive	6030		

\* Information obtained from CIWMB PARIS and the IRWMA 2002 annual report.

**Nondisposal Facilities.** Nondisposal facilities, which were identified in the NDFE, are listed in Table 6-13. Use of these facilities is continuing.

**Table 6-13. Nondisposal Facilities Used or Planned for Use by the IRWMA**

<b>Name/Type of Facility</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Jurisdictions Served</b>
Big Pine Transfer Station	Big Pine	County
Homewood Canyon Transfer Station	Homewood Canyon	County
Keeler Transfer Station	Keeler	County
Olancho Transfer Station	Olancho	County

The Big Pine Transfer Station also serves as a drop-off recycling center for antifreeze, brush/yard waste, car batteries, CRV containers, electronic waste, glass and plastic containers, household hazardous waste, metal, newspapers, oil filters, tin cans, used oil, and universal waste.

## **PERMITTED DISPOSAL CAPACITY**

Permitted disposal capacity is available in the County. Most wastes, which cannot be diverted, are transported to a network of active facilities (e.g., Bishop-Sunland, Independence, and Lone Pine landfills). These facilities have significantly more than the 15 years of disposal capacity for the solid wastes generated in Inyo County and the City of Bishop.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

The goals defined by the LTF in 1992 for the Countywide Siting Element (CSE), dated February 1999, are listed below:

- 1) Develop a long-term solid waste management infrastructure that will serve to enhance the environmental quality of life for county residents by promoting the safe collection, processing, and disposal of municipal solid waste generated within county boundaries;
- 2) Encourage residents and businesses to maximize source reduction (i.e., minimize waste generation) and minimize waste disposal;
- 3) Provide opportunities for residents and businesses to recycle waste materials; and
- 4) Ensure that long-term disposal capacity is available for waste that cannot be easily and economically recycled or composted.

These goals continue to be applicable.

Policies were also stated in the CSE (pages 3, 4) in order to achieve the goals. The policies were grouped to focus on safe disposal practices, minimization of waste generation, recycling and composting, and ensure long-term disposal capacity. The policies continue to be applicable to the RAIWMP implementation. A siting criteria was developed and a siting process was described in the CSE, as required by the regulations.

Current estimated permitted disposal capacity, as reported in the 2002 annual report, exceeds 80 years.

## **AVAILABLE MARKETS**

Markets for recovered recyclable materials have been variable. Though the market "material quantity" supply and demand and resulting market prices often fluctuate, outlets are available. The City and the County have relied upon the private sector for the marketability of recovered waste materials. The private sector accumulates sufficient recyclable materials quantities for shipment to markets.

## **IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE**

Changes in the implementation schedule have occurred but have not significantly affected the ability of the IRWMA to realize planned diversion goals.

## **OTHER ISSUES**

Nearly all of the selected and contingent programs have been and are continuing to be implemented. Although a few programs have been modified, overall program implementation has been discussed in the annual reports and the PARIS has been kept updated. The County and City continue to monitor evolving compliance issues.

*Inyo County Five-Year RAIWMP Review Report*

Consequently, the County feels that the most effective allocation of available resources at this time is to continue to utilize the existing RAIWMP as a planning tool augmented by the annual reports. Countywide resources are best directed toward the development and implementation of programs rather than revising current planning documents.

Where feasible and practical, increased efforts may be directed to quantifying (or estimating) diversion tonnages for implemented programs and recoverable materials. Through input provided by each jurisdiction, the IRWMA annual report will continue to be updated to reflect current performance and identify any changes desired in program selection and implementation.

In the 2002 annual report, the IRWMA reported that none of the planning elements needed to be revised. For these reasons, the County does not feel that revision of the RAIWMP is warranted or desirable at this time.

## **CHAPTER 7.0 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

The following appendices are included in this section.

- Appendix A Relevant Sections of the Public Resources Code
- Appendix B California Code of Regulations Section 18788
- Appendix C July 21, 2000 CIWMB Letter
- Appendix D LTF membership
- Appendix E Presentation Outline for the LTF's July 8, 2004 Meeting
- Appendix F July 22, 2004 LTF Letter to the County